

Exhibit D

[Emblem of the State of Israel]

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

Re:

Moshe Hananel

Represented by Adv.

Adi Fighel

The Plaintiff

Versus

1. Interface Partners International Limited

2. Sheldon G. Adelson

Represented by Adv.

Klagsbald and Adv. Amir Shraga

The Defendants

Present:

Plaintiff and counsel

Counsel for the Defendants

The Second Defendant

Transcript

Aryeh Lis is duly cautioned and testifies in direct examination

Everything stated in my affidavit is the truth.

Cross Examination

Q. According to what I know you've been in the tourism and hotel business for very many years

A. Right. Almost more than 30 years

Q. I saw in your affidavit and I read in the newspapers that you've also been dealing in this field of tourism and hotels in China

A. Right.

Q. Also in Macau

A. No.

Q. Referring to your affidavit in general, in '99 you approached Mr. Hananel in an attempt to interest him in a time-share project in Zhuhai

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

A. Right.

Q. And you also gave him two brochures which you describe

A. Right.

Q. I'm referring you to the brochures are these the brochures you gave the Plaintiff?

A. Yes these are the brochures. It's Exhibits M-1 and 2 to the Plaintiff's affidavit.

Q. These two brochures deal with Zhuhai

A. Right they deal with Zhuhai.

Q. These two brochures do not deal with Macau

A. There's a mention of Macau as part of Zhuhai.

Q. Show me where that's written?

A. (The witness inspects and looks) There are maps here,

Q. I'm enabling you to retract the answer and take your time inspecting the brochures.

A. I mean the map which is what actually shows (opens the map in M/2 on p. 7 of the brochure marked A)

Q. Is there anywhere else in the brochures that mentions that Macau is part of Zhuhai?

A. As far as I'm concerned the mention is the map. I haven't read the brochures in 9 years.

Q. You said that this map that you indicated is the only place you can say that mentions that Zhuhai is part of Macau – show us where you can see on the map that Zhuhai is part of Macau?

A. Zhuhai is the whole area in yellow and Macau is the white area. Macau is marked a circle with the letter B

Q. In what sense is Macau part of Zhuhai?

[Emblem of the State of Israel]

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

A. Until '99 Zhuhai didn't include Macau it was under Portuguese rule, and it returned to Chinese rule in '99 that's why it's marked there in a neutral white color. From a pertinent point of view that I want to promote a project in Zhuhai, I don't make a distinction because it's not necessary yet in the stage when I'm marketing a project to say which city belongs to which region and what it's status is it's very complicated in China, there's a highly detailed hierarchy and I have no need in my occupation to explain at an early stage, under what status such or another region is.

Q. Have you ever been to Macau?

A. No. Not Zhuhai either.

Q. Do you know in general or have you heard that Macau is an entirely defined and an entirely separate area in the sense that when you enter Macau you need to go through passport control your passport is stamped and you get an entry permit and when you leave Macau you need to go through passport control again do you know?

A. Yes. That's right.

Q. When you write in Section 1 of your affidavit that you approached the Plaintiff with a proposal to build a vacation project in Zhuhai near China I understand that the expression near Macau is a geographic description and the project you tried to interest the Plaintiff in was located in Zhuhai – is that right?

A. Right.

Q. And not in Macau

A. Right

Q. Is it true that the words in Section 1 of your affidavit "located near Macau" – these are words that the lawyers wrote?

A. These are things that I accepted as true.

Q. Look at your affidavit again, you could have written: without the words "near Macau" why were those words added?

A. When I came at that time in projects I always stated a location that is known and familiar because Zhuhai to the best of my experience wasn't known to people I spoke with but Macau is known as is Hong Kong.

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

- Q. I repeat, in your affidavit whose purpose I understand is not to market the project but to give testimony, when you come to give testimony what do you write the words "near Macau" for – I propose to you that those words were suggested to you by the attorneys who drafted the affidavit?
- A. Yes. They didn't tell me come write "near Macau" we also spoke about Hong Kong and about Zhuhai we used the map, where everything was clear.
- Q. From Section 5 I understand that a small project in Zhuhai is not a project you wanted to do alone but you were together with your colleagues – who are they?
- A. One of them is the company Epstein & Sons Dr. Yoav Serana and the other is an electrical engineer whose name of Alfonso Vater both of whom are Israeli and in addition there was a local team which was our contact people vis-à-vis the authorities.
- Q. When you say that they maintained contact with the authorities you mean the Zhuhai authorities?
- A. Right.
- Q. The Plaintiff in his affidavit of 2006 describes the meeting with you the first one and writes in Section 4.3 "During the meeting, I clarified to Mr. Lis that Adelson did not...a casino... building... in Zhuhai." Is it true what's written here?
- A. Yes.
- Q. This is something you describe in Section 4 of your affidavit?
- A. Right.
- Q. And in Section 5 you say that you approached your colleagues to receive clarifications from them?
- A. Right.
- Q. Whom did you contact
- A. Those people we worked with in Zhuhai – Chinese.
- Q. Was it an approach in writing?

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

A. No. Telephones and chats.

Q. Referring you to Section 4.4 of the Plaintiff's affidavit you gave him the two brochures we saw and told him that the casino issue was very realistic, that there was no tourist traffic to Zhuhai and that no international airline operated regularly... "there" is in Zhuhai?

A. Right.

Q. That's also what you describe in Section 5 of your affidavit?

A. (The witness peruses) Yes.

Q. You approached the Plaintiff you proposed to interest him in a project in Zhuhai he asked you questions about Zhuhai, you said what you said you gave him brochures of Zhuhai and answered questions he had about Zhuhai – is that right.

A. Geographically that's correct.

Q. There is some distinction between what you write and what the Plaintiff writes – the Plaintiff writes that you told him in Section 4.4 of the affidavit and compare to your affidavit in Section 5 you write that you told the Plaintiff that in my colleagues' opinion the casino issue was very realistic and the Plaintiff writes that you told him that also in your opinion the casino issue was very realistic – to be precise what's correct what the Plaintiff writes or what you write?

A. You I think are talking about the same thing. I had then a brochure for the investor in Hebrew and in English I found in the archive.

Q. That's not it, I'm repeating the question.

A. I finally understand the question. I understand that I'm being asked why in Section 5 of my affidavit I don't state that the casino's being realistic is also in my opinion as stated in Section 4.4 of the Plaintiff's affidavit – my answer, until I didn't accept my colleagues' opinion it was only in their opinion. After I received from people I trust their opinion the next time I spoke with Moshe it was also in my opinion.

Q. In fact in your affidavit you describe 3 meetings that you had with the Plaintiff, right?

[Emblem of the State of Israel]

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

A. Right.

Q. The one in Section 3 of your affidavit,

A. Yes, that's the first.

Q. The second in Section 5,

A. Yes.

Q. And the third in Section 6

A. Yes.

Q. At the third meeting you write that it was held at the First Defendant's offices?

A. Right.

Q. Where were the first two meetings held?

A. At the same office. At the diamond exchange area one of the tall buildings. All the meetings were there.

Q. That was the first time you met the Plaintiff?

A. We were in business many years before in the context of my other jobs,

Q. And you'd meet?

A. Certainly. Not often, once a season in preparation for the next season.

Q. This was when he worked at Galilee Tours?

A. Right.

Q. And you worked at Isrotel

A. Yes.

Q. When did you stop working at Isrotel

A. In '92

Q. And after '92 you continued to meet with the Plaintiff on business matters?

[Emblem of the State of Israel]

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

A. Once or twice in the context of the entry of an international management company to Israel which I advised

Q. When

A. In '92 or '93

Q. And if I'm talking about the second half of the 1990s – let's say even '96 onward until those 3 meetings did you meet the Plaintiff?

A. To the best of my recollection no.

Q. And this group of 3 meetings in the second half of the 1990s was only in the context described in your affidavit?

A. Yes.

Q. Can it be that those three meetings that you describe were in '98 and not in '99?

A. Absolutely not. Certainly not.

Q. Do you have your engagement diary from those years

A. No. I have dates of correspondence that I had in that period.

Q. What period

A. Also in '97 or '96 or '99 – but I don't have diaries.

Q. Yesterday we obtained the (business) appointment diaries of the Plaintiff and we found there in '98 3 meetings between you and him, the one on February 12, 1998 the other on March 10, 1998 after the meeting on March 9 was cancelled, and the third on March 29, 1998 – all in '98. In view of the things that you said until now do you have an explanation for what I'm telling you?

A. I have no logical explanation because I don't remember those meetings, and the meetings in the following year were following the engagement that was the basis after which I went out to talk with investors, to look and to develop.

Q. Do you have an explanation?

A. I don't have an explanation and I don't think it happened.

[Emblem of the State of Israel]

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

Q. Referring to the Plaintiff's Complaint in the Macau claim, he describes the meetings with you, referring to Section 4.1 of the Complaint, in early 99... in the region of Macau – ycs?

A. Yes.

Q. When it says in the region of Macau – what's meant is the venture in Zhuhai – is that right?

A. I don't know I didn't write it. I don't know in early '99 the agreement with which I came to the First Defendant's¹ offices was signed at the end of March 99.

Q. Assuming that the description refers to you,

A. The question does it refer to me?

Q. Assuming. The tourism venture that's written means Zhuhai?

A. As far as I'm concerned it's the same region.

Q. I'm asking another question when it says in the Macau region is that the project in Zhuhai?

A. There was no other venture.

Q. In Section 4.4 it's the same thing? Right? It means the project in Zhuhai? Right

A. It says.

Q. But it says in the Macau region? Does it mean the project in Zhuhai?

A. I didn't come with a project in Macau. I came with a project in the area in Zhuhai in the region. Zhuhai is the region.

Q. Referring to Section 6 of your affidavit, after 2 or 3 weeks after what you described, the Plaintiff called you and asked you to meet him and the Second Defendant at the First Defendant's offices

¹ Translator's note: The 'First' Defendant will be used in the translation to denote the נרבעת, i.e. 'Defendant' in the female form, meaning Interface, whereas the 'Second' Defendant will be used to denote the נרבע, i.e. 'Defendant' in the male form, meaning Mr. Adelson.

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

A. Right

Q. In other words, the Plaintiff asked that you come to the First Defendant's offices for a meeting with him with the Second Defendant

A. Yes.

Q. And that's of course with respect to the same project in Zhuhai in which you tried to interest the Plaintiff?

A. Right. And also the answers that I brought and were checked in accordance with the Plaintiff's request.

Q. You say in Section 6 that you came to the offices and before the Second Defendant arrived at the office you spoke with the Plaintiff, that the Second Defendant was about to fly to Hong Kong in his private jet and that he hoped to convince him to go to Macau?

A. It was said.

Q. Meaning he hoped to convince him to come to Zhuhai? Is that right?

A. You're giving a geography test... The Plaintiff told me that the Second Defendant intended to travel to Macau. There are two airports with international landings and I saw no importance to whether he landed in one of the two airports one in Zhuhai and one in Macau.

Q. You're talking all the time with the Plaintiff about a project in Zhuhai, and he asks you questions about Zhuhai and you answer about Zhuhai and he tells you come to the office and meet the Second Defendant in connection with the project in Zhuhai

A. No, it wasn't discussed. I came with the project in Zhuhai specifically which is near Macau. We came to promote an issue of a project in the region without the nuances Zhuhai or Macau, there was an agreement a memorandum of understanding – genuine signed with the authorities. To the Court's question where the intended location for such project was I refer to the map in Exhibit M/2 on p. 7 in one of the bays in the Fai-Cha area marked C.

Q. And the signed memorandum that you said was with the authorities – where is it?

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

A. The witness presents to the Court – dated March 26, 1999 P/33 I'm referring to the end of the English part where a stamp is imprinted and the date March 26, 1999 is stated.

Q. And this is a memorandum that was signed with the Zhuhai authorities?

A. One of the bodies which owns the land – a governmental body in Zhuhai.

Q. In other words at the time of your meeting with the Plaintiff it was before he knew whether the Second Defendant would agree to travel to an area that you refer to as the Macau area but he hoped that he would convince him to do so. Is that right?

A. Yes.

Q. At the end of Section 6 of your affidavit, you say that the Plaintiff brought you into the Second Defendant's room for a short introduction meeting, is that right?

A. Right.

Q. Describe to the Court what happened?

A. A short courtesy meeting. He introduced me and said what I was doing there we spoke for a few minutes. It was a courtesy meeting, net. Nothing to do with business from my point of view. I wasn't asked what I was doing at the meeting it was clear that it was known.

Q. When you Plaintiff introduced you to the Second Defendant what did he say about you?

A. He told about the background and where I came from.

Q. What did he say

A. I can't remember it was 9 years ago. I don't remember the exact words. We didn't talk about investments.

Q. Could it be that he just said the names?

A. Definitely not.

Q. Tell us what he said.

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

- A. I remember he told about my background and my connection with David Lewis in Eilat and about what was being done in China and what I was doing at the office. It filled the short time we sat down and nothing more than that. What exactly he said I don't think I can remember.
- Q. You say in Section 7 of your affidavit, in a telephone conversation that was held following the Second Defendant's trip and you say it was about two weeks after the meeting at the First Defendant's offices? I'm telling you that the Second Defendant returned from the East on September 3, 1999.
- A. I didn't speak with the Second Defendant I spoke with the Plaintiff.
- Q. Think about your answer. The Plaintiff tells you in Section 7 about the Second Defendant's impression from the visit, the impression is at the end of the visit. The Second Defendant finished his visit on September 3 and what you write from the perspective of the time frames is impossible – can it be that the conversation you held with the Plaintiff was in September or October
- A. I assume that if I speak with the CEO of a company he tells me certain information I don't need to check how it reached him... as far as I'm concerned the answer was shortly after the meeting at the office.
- Q. Referring to Section 7 of your affidavit, you describe the conversation between you and the Plaintiff, you say that the Second Defendant visited Macau following his endeavors and that he was impressed by the region and Macau?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Were the words that you were told that the Second Defendant was impressed with what was going on in the region and in Macau or he was impressed by what was going on in the Macau region or he was impressed by what was going on in the East or he was impressed by what was going on in the Hong Kong area?
- A. I can't remember what the original reference was to.
- Q. I therefore propose to you again that this connection of the language is in fact something that the lawyers wrote and you...
- A. Not necessarily. I didn't dictate these words, it's a summary of a discussion where the situation in which I was required to testify was explained to me. We

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

reconstructed the information in those meetings but not with the Plaintiff at the offices of the Plaintiff's attorneys.

Q. You spoke with the Plaintiff too before your testimony?

A. Of course.

Q. And in those preparations it was explained to you what the claim was about.

A. At a later stage the details but at the beginning yes.

Q. Were you also shown documents?

A. No. Not affidavits either.

Q. But it was explained to you that the complaint was in connection with a claim that the Plaintiff had with respect to Macau – is that right?

A. Right.

Q. Therefore, you wrote the words in Section 7 of your affidavit "... in Macau... was impressed in Macau..." while you don't recall the precise words as I proposed to you earlier – is that right

A. I don't recall and I didn't make a precise distinction between Zhuhai and Macau.

To the Court's question

Q. This agreement did the Plaintiff know about it? Did you show it to the Plaintiff?

A. That's what I came with. It was the main document.

Q. This document, its signing was done after the Plaintiff told you that they were letting go of this issue of an investment in the area or before or during

A. Without this document I wouldn't have started out and wouldn't have come and promoted the project.

[Emblem of the State of Israel]

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

Completion of Cross Examination

Q. Did you show P/33 to Mr. Adelson?

A. No.

Redirect

None

Recess

Mr. Koby Eric is duly cautioned and testifies in direct examination

Q. When did you start working for the Second Defendant's family?

A. In '98.

Q. When did you finish working?

A. I think it was in September '02

Q. When did you find out that the Plaintiff had summoned you to testify in Israel?

A. A few months before last Yom Kippur. Around July August I don't remember exactly.

Q. Until this time that you found out that you had been summoned to testify did the Second Defendant or anyone on his behalf get in touch with you?

A. There was once that Mr. Lahav Zohar contacted me following a post-employment dispute when The Venetian hotel didn't pay me unemployment pay. It was the only contact it was a few months after I was fired.

Q. And after you found out that you had been summoned to testify in this case a few months ago after that date has anyone been in touch with you?

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

A. Sean Ben Menachem called me a few times and left messages. If I'm not mistaken he even spoke to my wife even once following that conversation I decided to return his call.

Q. When was that

A. I believe 1 or 1.5 months before last Yom Kippur.

Q. What happened in the phone call

A. The conversation was a little bit of small talk and then he raised the issue of there being a trial in Israel between the Plaintiff and the Second Defendant and told me that I shouldn't get involved and it's rich people's business and I would lose in the matter. I told him that the only person I would be willing to talk to is Mr. Adelson himself and then the conversation ended with that he would get them off my back. To the question who's they I reply the family, I don't know who he meant and that was that. No, there was something else, when I mentioned that I wanted to talk to Mr. Adelson he told me that they couldn't make contact with me because I was testifying in favor of the other party.

Q. Did he ask you to make contact with anyone?

A. He asked if it was O.K. for Sheldon's lawyer to talk to me. I told him that I wasn't talking to anyone apart from Mr. Adelson.

Q. Does Sean have your phone number?

A. Sean and I haven't been in touch since Sean was fired I believe it was in '99 every so often I would see him in Malibu. I was pretty surprised that he called me. I left him a message after I was fired from The Venetian I left him a message because he was in the security business. I asked him to help me find a job in the field. The first time I heard from him was 6 years later.

Q. How did you feel about this phone call?

A. I was surprised to get a call from a person I hadn't spoken to and who didn't return my call when I needed him, I felt threatened, I didn't understand how he got my phone [number] and I had moved to another country, to Canada. When I asked him how he got my phone [number] he said it was his job to find people. I felt uncomfortable with that.

Q. Did Sean Ben Menachem tell you whether he was a witness in the trial

[Emblem of the State of Israel]

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

A. Yes. He told me that he had received a summons from the Court and that he didn't intend to show up.

Q. Did anyone else call you after the conversation with Ben Menachem?

A. I was contacted by the Second Defendant's lawyer, Klaksbad I think it was before last Yom Kippur we had two conversations. In both of them he called me. In the first conversation he started describing the issue I don't remember exactly, but I think I told him that the only person I was prepared to talk to was the Second Defendant. In the second conversation (the witness thinks) I told him that I was prepared to meet with the Second Defendant, he said that for him it created an uncomfortable situation that I would meet with the Second Defendant, I would achieve my goal and if I didn't sign an affidavit in his favor then I would have gotten what I wanted and he wouldn't have gotten what he wanted. I repeat, the lawyer said that we're in a situation that I would get my meeting with the Second Defendant, and he wouldn't get the affidavit from me that's what I assume he meant and then we decided that he would arrange a meeting for me with Adelson after the trial.

Q. Was any other contact made with you?

A. There was indirect contact my father who is a senior person in the defense system was called to a meeting in the disguise of some offer to meet Mr. Lahav Zohar and Doron Bitan, they met at one of the hotels in Tel Aviv during the conversation it transpired that it wasn't any offer but an attempt to try to influence him (the father) to influence me at the trial itself. And my father told them according to what I understand that Eric is a big boy and knows what to say. And walked out of the meeting. It was stopped.

Q. Are you afraid to testify.

A. First I have not only fears it's unpleasantness and I feel uncomfortable about the whole situation. It bothers me what will happen in the future after the trial.

Q. What was your position when you started working for the Adelson family?

A. I started doing night shifts at the family home and afterwards started working with the Second Defendant's eldest son, combined with a day shift and slowly started working with Mr. and Mrs. Adelson.

Q. It was throughout the year

[Emblem of the State of Israel]

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

- A. It was continuous. Also when they were on holiday. There were shifts and I had days off.
- Q. I'm referring you to a flight itinerary from a flight of the Second Defendant's to the East in August '99 you didn't participate in this trip is that right?
- A. According to what can be seen here I wasn't on this flight.
- Q. Did you know about this flight?
- A. Yes. I know about this flight, I believe a flight in Hong Kong there was the incident in which some hooligans broke into the room when the Second Defendant was in the hall in one of the hotels in Hong Kong.

The Defendants' Counsel:

We object to all hearsay testimony.

- Q. From where did you hear about the incident.
- A. I didn't only hear, but the Second Defendant showed me in one of our later trips to the East and he showed me where it happened and I was there in the room. There was also talk in the security team.
- Q. Were there changes in the security team following the incident?
- A. If I'm not mistaken Sean Ben Menachem was fired after this trip.
- Q. Was there a change to your and the bodyguards' employment conditions following this incident?
- A. I don't know if it's following the incident or not, but at some stage we became employees of The Venetian.
- Q. From the point of view of the compensation for the work what happened?
- A. Until then we worked through a local company in Las Vegas by the name of SOA.

The Defendants' Counsel:

I don't understand the relevance. And he didn't come to testify about that.

[Emblem of the State of Israel]

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

Q. In the manner of jobs that you did after you moved over to being employed by the hotel – was there a change or did you continue doing the same security work for the Second Defendant's family?

A. The task remained the same task guarding the Adelson family.

Q. Did you perform security work for the hotel?

A. We didn't perform additional work for the hotel.

The Defendants' Counsel:

I'm referring my colleague to that he's asking leading questions.

Q. Referring to another flight itinerary in the period of March April 2000 (filed in the Plaintiff's exhibits) marked P/34 describe to us the trip you participated in?

A. I took part in the trip, we left on a flight from Ben Gurion we went around a few places, we arrived after a few stops, we arrived also to Macau and also to Hong Kong.

Q. How did you fly there?

A. In Mr. Adelson's private jet.

Q. What other security personnel were on the flight?

A. There were no other security personnel.

Q. You arrived in Macau and then what?

A. Passport control, I remember this flight because I was stopped I flew with an Israeli passport at the time and we had to pay for the visa, that's how we got into Macau.

Q. And what did you do there?

A. In Macau if I'm not mistaken we went around there what I remember from this trip, we stopped at a casino where you had to go in with suits, there were meetings with a few people – that's vaguely what I remember. We continued to Hong Kong.

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

Q. Were there any other people with you?

A. We were joined during the trip by several Chinese representatives of The Venetian hotel.

Q. Did they wait in Macau?

A. I think they joined before Macau, according to what's written here they joined in Singapore.

Q. How did you get through passport control in Macau?

A. Usually a person would wait who would help us with passport control, from there out to the waiting car.

Q. In Hong Kong you went through control in a similar manner.

A. Yes. Either representatives would wait or we'd go through passport control on our own.

Q. Presenting to you a brochure that was attached Exhibit N to the Plaintiff's affidavit. Do you remember this brochure?

A. Yes.

Q. From where?

A. It was on the plane.

Q. When was the next time you flew with Adelson to Macau?

The Defendant's counsel:

I object. It's a leading question.

Q. Were you in Macau again?

A. Yes.

Q. When

The Labor Courts

Tel Aviv Jaffa District Labor Court

Labor Case 006245/01

Labor Case 7704/03

Before the Hon. Justice Ilan Itach

December 20, 2007

Public Representative (Employers) Mr. Amiram Miller

Public Representative (Employees) Mr. Maoz Halevy

A. There was a trip in 2001 there was a trip to the East around 2000 some time when they found the Dakar (the submarine). There were other trips in 2002 and I don't remember the dates.

Q. Specify with whom were you on those trips? What did you do in Macau on those trips?

A. In Macau there was a trip in which we went around on a main street where there were casinos. We were in a few casinos there, on the last trip I worked with the children, we stayed in the area in the resort hotel. On that same trip we went to see a plot of land on which the casino that Mr. Adelson intended to build in Macau was supposed to be built.

Q. In total how many times did you travel to Macau?

A. About 6 or 7 times.

Q. Did you meet with people there?

A. We met with a lot of people. We met with people on every trip. I don't know exactly who they were. Apart from two meetings that were at the Governor of Macau's house.

Q. With whom did you meet there?

A. Of course there were other people Mr. and Mrs. Adelson, in the first trip there was a dinner at which I was present there was a dinner at the Governor's house.

Q. Where did you sleep?

A. In some of the trips, I was in Macau twice once at the Mandarin hotel and another time at the Westin Resort. The other times we slept in Hong Kong, at the Peninsula hotel.

Q. How did Mr. and Mrs. Adelson react to Macau?

A. There was enthusiasm.

Q. Can you place according to the dates, according to the trips.

A. I can't place according to the dates and the trips.